DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 654 SP 028 562

AUTHOR King, Robert L.
TITLE Integrating School Evaluation with Inservice Education: A Paradigm for Staff Development.
PUB DATE Feb 87
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Washington, DC, February 12-15, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; Elementary Education; *Improvement Programs; *Inservice Teacher Educat[illegible] Program Effectiveness; *Program Eval[illegible] f Evaluation (Groups); *Self Evaluation ([illegible] : Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Using suggested guidelines for the imp[illegible]ement of inservice programs benefits," the process of the school evaluation was viewed as a form of staff education program was designed. In lieu of the idea that "team based problem solving can give individual teachers significant staff development benefits," the process of the school evaluation was viewed as a form of staff development or inservice education. The school evaluation/inservice education model providing means of evaluating elementary school programs incorporates five phases: (1) psychological readiness for change; (2) development of self-assessment skills and procedures; (3) examination of evaluative criteria for school improvement; (4) formation of external evaluation teams consisting of three classroom teachers, one special teacher, one school administrator; and (5) designing a follow-up questionnaire. This year-long self-study program assessed buildings, administration, curriculum, and staff and support services at an elementary school in Pennsylvania. The Attitude Toward Inservice (ATI) instrument was administered at the beginning and end of the program. The Level of Use (LoU) instrument was administered at the end of the program. This paper describes the development and implementation of the program, and discusses the results as revealed by responses to the ATI and LoU measurement instruments. A copy of the ATI instrument is appended as well as a graphical depiction of the over-all LoU. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED278654

INTEGRATING SCHOOL EVALUATION WITH INSERVICE EDUCATION: A PARADIGM FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

AACTE ANNUAL MEETINGE

Washington, D.C.
February 12-15, 1987

Robert L. King, D.Ed.
Professor of Education
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R.L. King

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Whether we call it staff development or professional development or something else, the mental image that teachers have of inservice education depends on what they experience in its mane" (Lawrence, 1982).

Inservice education, more recently referred to as staff development, is an established tradition in the education profession (Korineck, McAdams, Schmid, 1985). It has been in effect since the onset of public school education.

"Traditionally inservice training programs have been hastily prepared, ineptly presented educationally stultifying events" (Sportsman, 1981). In the opinion of many teachers the concept of inservice education is out-dated and irrelevant. Mary Louise Holly conducted research regarding teacher's attitudes toward inservice education and found that "teachers do desire to take part in professional development" (Holly, 1982). The teachers in this study suggested that they should be involved in the planning, implementing and evaluating. The teachers also suggested that their most valuable sources of information were their colleagues (Holly, 1982).

Medley and McCormick, (1985), suggest a systematic approach to on-site inservicing as a positive component in effective professional growth and development. In lieu of this idea in a recent survey of school personnel at a Utah elementary school, "workshop at school", was found to be the highest priority item in a list of possible inservice methods (Farnworth, 1981). "Of the thousands of school systems that require inservice, too many allow

inservice education to be a token effort--a day set aside here, a speaker or two brought in there with all the decision made by higher ups" (Cole, 1982).

Suggested guidelines for effective inservice programs have been made by many. Hutson (1981), reveals that those who receive the training should be actively involved. This staff participation provides for intrinsic motivation toward the program. Howey (1985) suggested six purposes for staff development: 1) continuing pedagogical development, 2) continuing understanding and discovery of self, 3) continuing cognitive development, 4) continuing theoretical development, 5) continuing professional development, and 6) continuing career development.

There are many alternatives to the traditional inservice education programs and guidelines for development and improvement. Redesign and improvement of inservice programs has occurred on the state level as well. Since 1968, the Pennsylvania State Board of Education has been approving and revising guidelines for inservice and developmental activities. One such model was devised in 1975 by the Bureau of Curriculum Services, Pennsylvania Department of Education. The guidelines stated that the inservice education should be..."planned experiences, activities and studies to increase professional educator's knowledge and improve their skills (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1975)".

In our dynamic society inservice programs cannot fall short of providing knowledge and professional staff development. "The staff development of the eighties is not the same as the inservice

education of earlier decades." (Berlinger, Fernstermacher, 1985). "The rapid growth in our acquisition of knowledge makes some teaching strategies obsolete" (Korineck, Schmid, McAdams, 1985). Staff development plans are most likely to succeed when they provide opportunities for intrinsic professional rewards, positive interaction among colleagues, acquisition of knowledge and on-going improvement of school programs and program evaluation by the participants.

Utilizing the suggested guidelines for the improvement of inservice programs as well as total school improvement, a school evaluation/inservice education program was designed. In lieu of the idea that "team based problem solving can give individual teachers significant staff development benefits" (Louis, Molitor, Rosenblum, 1981), the process of the school evaluation was viewed as a form of staff development or inservice education. The School Evaluation Criteria (King, 1981) developed at Indiana University of Pennsylvania served as the model for the school evaluation study.

The school evaluation/inservice education model providing means of evaluating elementary school programs incorporates five phases:

1. Psychological readiness for change

   To determine psychological readiness for change, the evaluating teams met with various administrators from the Intermediate Unit level, superintendent level and building

level. They also met with classroom and special teachers. To gain an inside knowledge of the organizational structure, individual behaviors and underlying belief systems, the evaluator spent a great deal of time interacting with the staff. Process skills were employed to ally fears, create a relaxed setting, discuss problems and emphasize the overall program as one of analysis, not appraisal.

2. Self-assessment skills and procedures

   Several assessment models were utilized to develop the self-assessment instrument. Among them were the Middle State, NCATE, Pennsylvania Department of Education, and Intermediate Unit #4, 15, and 28. Various inservice meetings were held to develop the self-assessment skills and procedures.

3. Evaluative criteria for measurement were examined:

   -School and Community
   -Philosophy and Objective
   -School Staff and Administration
   -Faculty Data
   -Areas for Learning (Art, Health and Safety, Language Arts, Mathematics, Music, Physical Education, Reading, Science, and Social Studies)
   -Alternative Education Program
   -Learning Media Services

-Pupil Services

-School and Plant Facilities

4. External evaluation teams

The identification of the external evaluation teams was made by the school administrators, Intermediate Unit personnel and consultants. The team consisted of three classroom teachers, one special teacher, one school administrator, one higher education staff member and one Intermediate Unit administrator. Team members were trained in skills of on-site evaluation techniques two seeks prior to the actual school visit. Evaluation logistics took place one day prior to on-site evaluation.

5. Follow-up Study

The final phase would be to administer a follow-up questionnaire designed to assess progress of the school districts in the implementation of the recommendations, made by the external evaluation team.

Many educators view inservice training and professional development as activities designed to improve the competencies of education personnel through course work and learning materials. Rather, it should be looked upon as any activity designed to provide:

(1) help to teachers on an individual basis in the classrooms,

(2) help to groups of teachers in the form of planned experiences which the teachers can study and carry out individually and independently, and

(3) help to groups of teachers working as groups on planned study and practice (Oliva, p. 395).

In this regard, staff development should be considered as a process for growth rather than for improvement (Byrne, 1983). While the growth concept is a motivating factor and helps to personalize the inservice activities, "improvement" connotes the assimilation of unilateral decisions as part of a handed-down requirement. The study is based on the growth definition of staff development.

Another perspective of this study is the consideration of innovation as a change agent. Growth and development are tantamount to a change from a lower stage or position to a level that is higher and perhaps more desirable. There is no doubt that school evaluation consists of experiences, activities and studies to increase professional educators' knowledge and to improve their skills.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the study was two fold: 1) To assess teachers feelings concerning teacher inservice at the beginning and at the conclusion of the study and 2) To establish the underlying

relationships between concerns (categories) about innovation and levels of use of the innovation among school personnel. The present study was patterned after the model developed by Loucks and Hall (1974), and Loucks and other (1975), which related teacher use of innovation to their concerns about innovation. The premise of this study was based on the idea that by utilizing this school evaluation model which provides for the assessment of the school program, the teaching staff comes to view their involvement in school inservice in a positive way. Through a variety of analyses, construct validity was established.

Hall and others have said that the intensity and rate of use of innovation is based on the stages of concern that teachers and school personnel have about the innovation. The stages of concern or categories considered are knowledge, acquiring information, sharing, assessing, planning, status reporting, and performing (Loucks and others, 1975). These concerns or categories occur within the dimensions of levels of use. The dimensions are described by the behaviors of users ranging from orientation through integration and renewal. The more conceptually the use, the higher will be the level of use.

METHODOLOGY

Sample

This evaluation/inservice program was conducted at the Penns Manor Area School District, Clymer, Pennsylvania. Throughout the 1985-86 academic year, the Penns Manor Elementary School was the

location of a year long self-study. The elementary school teachers and the school principal (S1) participated in a self-study process to assess buildings, administration, curriculum, staff and supportive services. Seven groups were formed with the group leader constituting the sub-sample (S2).

INSTRUMENTATION

Two instruments were used, the Attitude Toward Inservice (ATI), (Appendix A) and the Level of Use [LoU] instrument (Loucks, Newlove & Hall, 1975). The ATI consisted of 32 statements developed by Trueblood and Trueblood of the Pennsylvania State University. The statements dealt with feelings about inservice. The following statements are representative of items on the questionnaire:

1. I believe inservice programs can be used to help teachers improve the organization and content of my schools, curriculum.
2. I feel inservice programs provide me with the opportunity to gain recognition and additional responsibilities.

The LoU instrument was a structured interview format. Interview questions solicited responses about the stages or categories that user (and prospective users) were involved in. For example, the question "Can you describe the evaluation process that you are engaged in right now?" was aimed at probing for Knowledge category. If the innovation can be described and there is evidence of how it can be used on a day-to-day basis (i.e. in

the short-run), then the user is considered to be at the Level III (Mechanical Use) level of use.

The levels of use start with Level 0 (Non-Use) and include Level I (Orientation), Level II (Preparation), Level III (Mechanical Use), Level IV (Routine), Level V (Integration), and Level VI (Renewal). The user is at a particular level regardless of whether he/she is acquiring information, sharing, assessing, planning, status reporting or performing.

PROCEDURES

The Attitude Toward Inservice (ATI) questionnaire was administered at the beginning of the school year in September to S1 and also near the end of the school year in March. The mean and standard deviation for both the pre- and post- scores were then obtained.

The data from the 32 statements on the ATI were grouped into three factors. These factors were: General Expectations, Potential for Change and Improvement, and Past Benefits.

The group leaders (S2) were selected by the school principal and represented areas, such as science, social studies, mathematics, language arts, curriculum resources, support services, etc. The teachers met in committees and shared the responsibility of gathering information and sharing ideas about one particular area of the school, ie: Language Arts, Social Studies, School and Community, etc. The committees were comprised of teachers from different grade levels. All days set aside

initially for "inservice training" were devoted to the analysis of the school programs and for data gathering activities that the teachers needed to complete their section of the self-study document.

One month from the administration of the ATI, trained LoU interviewers collected data from S2. This was repeated at the end of the project in March.

Data collected from these seven group leaders were analyzed for levels of use by two trained LoU raters. It enabled the researcher to assess the intensity and rate of use of the innovation.

RESULTS

Items from ATI were clustered along the three factors as follows:

Factor I : (3), (4), (6), (9), (11), (15), (16), (17), (19), (20), (23), (27), (29), (30), (32)

Factor II : (1), (5), (7), (12), (18), (24), (25), (31)

Factor III: (2), (8), (10), (13), (14), (21), (22), (26), (28)

For many items there was no significant difference concerning teachers attitudes regarding inservice education as indicated by the means and standard deviations for the pre- and post-administration of the ATI questionnaire. For example Item 1, Factor II - --inservice programs can be used to help teachers improve the organization and content of the school's curriculum - showed a mean of 4.176 (pre) and a mean of 4.167 (post).

Similarly Item 13, Factor III -- belief in central office administrators' and supervisors' awareness of the needs of teachers showed a mean of 2.559 (pre) and a mean of 2.967 (post).

Appendix B shows graphical representations of overall LoU across the various categories for the seven group leaders. The graphs as drawn are the data obtained from the LoU interviews. The broken lines represent LoU at the Start of the project, while the solid lines show the LoU at the conclusion of the study.

DISCUSSION

Attitude Toward Inservice

Analysis of teacher attitude toward inservice tended to support the idea that teachers are prepared to make changes and modifications if they believe that such changes are necessary or desirable (Singh, 1985). Teachers disagreed that "changes and innovations provided through inservice were unrealistic" and strongly agreed that they felt professional development programs can be instrumental in helping teachers "improve the organization and content" of the school's curriculum.

Teachers also strongly disagreed that they "dislike" inservice programs because of their tendency to oppose change. The study supported work by Miles (1983) that teacher-administrator harmony was important if an innovation is to succeed. They reported they felt good when principals do appreciate their implementation of innovation. Teachers, however

tended by to disagree that the public will not support them despite their efforts to grow professionally.

Results also showed a strong disagreement concerning teachers interest in inservice programs. Teachers felt inservice programs played no part in improving their status in the school district.

Level of Use (LoU)

A descriptive analysis of the level of use interview appeared to corroborate research on innovation. First, innovation users are often concerned with adequate knowledge about the innovation and what it means for them (Hall, 1976). Teachers were on a fairly high level, of use with seventy-one percent of those surveyed being on overall level IV or above in the knowledge category (See Appendix B).

Second, the needs of users of innovation for feedback is paramount in achieving high intensity and rate of innovation use (Bryles & Tillman, 1985). Most teachers feared that the results would, as usual, not be considered or implemented. Bird (1984) found that users may be disillusioned if previous "proposed solutions were ignored" or improperly adapted.

Third, the results clearly showed the necessity for innovations to be clearly defined (Loucks & Zacchei, 1983) and for users (teachers in this case) to set goals and to be helped to achieve those goals (Berliner, 1983). Most teachers reported the greatest strength of the process was the opportunity to meet and discuss with members of other departments and learn about other curricular areas.

Teacher professional growth has been shown to be enhanced through teacher research efforts (Mohlman & others, 1982; Jalongo, 1986) and personal adaptation through self-discovery (McCarthy, 1982). The process of school evaluation by teachers, made them seek information and analyze such information in order to make decisions. In this respect, the process provided an avenue for research.

The process of school evaluation as an alternate approach to inservice education embarked upon in the present study has added impetus to the concept of staff development as a process for teacher "growth" rather than teacher "improvement." This distinction in nomenclature further emphasized "growth" as a motivating factor which helps to personalize inservice activities. The high level of overall performance obtained from the LoU analysis is indicative of the teachers' greater sense of cooperation and of being a part of the decision-making process.

While this study has its limitations, it has provided a basis for further research in teacher inservice education. More pertinent analytical tools are being developed to explain the data collected. The implications and perceptions outlined in the following section of this report emanated from the results of this project. They point to a major conclusion that school evaluation by teachers is a positive activity for professional development.

SCHOOL DISTRICT PERCEPTIONS, IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES AND FOLLOW-UP

PERCEPTIONS

The administration, school board, faculty and community perceptions played a key role in the evaluation process as well as the on going staff development that resulted.

The administration's proposal to undertake this endeavor was fully endorsed by the school board. They viewed this process as crucial for future planning. The administration was directed to keep the board abreast of the progress and further assured that a commitment would be made to implement recommendations that were consistent with the district philosophy and feasible in terms of the budgetary process.

The initial presentation given to the faculty included reasons for the evaluation, the process, and time line. It was immediately apparent that anxiety and apprehension were being felt. Concerns about time available, their specific role, the extent of district commitment etc. were voiced.

As committees were formed, meetings held, and discussions of programs occurred, a change was noted. It culminated with a feeling of ownership and pride in what they had accomplished. They were pleased and confident when the on-site review took place. This was substantiated as 95 to 98% of the faculty responded positively to a staff questionnaire dealing with their experience.

The community received notification that the evaluation was taking place. They were further surveyed in order to gain the most current data. Presentations were made to the Parent Organization outlining purposes and procedures used in the evaluation. The community was more interested in seeing the end product. Few questions were directed to the school during the process. Direct involvement from members of the community is now a part of the implementation process.

IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES

The Evaluation Team provided the school administration and committee chairpersons with an exit report upon the completion of their visit. This report highlighted their findings enumerating both strengths and weaknesses of the school program.

The completed Visiting Team Report (VTR) report was given to the school board at a workshop approximately six weeks after the on-site visit. The board studied the conclusions drawn from the VTR in the form of strengths and recommendations. Clarifications were provided as needed, resulting in an open discussion on ways to properly review, gain input, and implement recommendations as well as expand upon commendations/strengths of the school's program.

The curriculum committee of the school board consisting of board members, administration, and teachers reviewed the VTR and suggested a systematic approach to setting realistic priorities. Based upon the recommendations of the curriculum committee, the

school board set in motion a five year plan for school improvement with staff and community involvement.

The curriculum committee held two meetings within six weeks during the summer. The following recommendations were made to the Board:

1. Create an Advisory Council of parents, teachers, administrators and board members.
2. Permit administration to contact parent volunteers to serve on the advisory committee.
3. Have the administration outline the major task of the advisory committee and schedule monthly meetings.
4. Require the principal to immediately implement those recommendations that are non-budgetary and administrative in nature.
5. Have the principal appoint five teachers to serve as committee chairpersons, by disciplines, to give advisory committee input and priorities to implement recommendations.

FOLLOW-UP

The Advisory Council has met monthly since August of 1986. Thirty-seven percent of the recommendations have been implemented as of October 1986. Major budgetary items (additional staff) have been prioritized with the top two items being considered by the Budget and Finance Committee for addition in the 1987-88 budget. The task of constructing a five year Long Range Plan is in progress.

The faculty curriculum committees have now expanded their roles. Each curriculum committee is chaired by a classroom teacher who is paid a stipend to service in this position. Curriculum revision initiatives in reading, math, science, social

studies and language arts have provided for on-going communication between grade levels resulting in a more comprehensive view of modification and development.

REFERENCES

Berlinger, David (1982). Improving Teacher's Effectiveness: A Conversation. Educational Leadership, 40:12-15.

Bird, T. (1984). Mutual Adaptation and Mutual Accomplishment: Images of Change in a Field Experiment. Teachers College Record, 86:68-83.

Broyles, I. and Tillman, M. (1985). Relationship of Inservice Training Components and Changes in Teacher Concerns Regarding Innovations. Journal of Educational Research, 78:364-70.

Byrne, Robert (1983). Inservice Programs: What are the Essentials for Making Them Effective? NASSP Bulletin, 67:4-7.

Bureau of Curriculum Services (1975). Guidelines for Approved Inservice. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1.

Cole, R. W. (1982). Inservice is not a verb. Phi Delta Kappan, 63,6, 370.

Fransworth, B. J. (1981). Professional Development: PReferred method of principals & teachers. Education, 101, 332-34.

Hall, Gene E. (1976). Study of Individual Teacher and Professor Concerns about Innovations. Journal of Teacher Education, 27: 22-3.

Howey, K. R. Six major functions of staff development: A expanded imperative. Journal of Teacher Education, 58-64.

Jalongo, Mary Renck (1986). Decisions that Affect Teachers' Professional Development. Childhood Education, 62(5):251-6.

King, R. L., and Carey, T. (19810. Elementary School Evaluation Criteria. Unpublished document, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, ARIN Intermediate Unit #28, Indiana, Pennsylvania.

Korineck, L. R., McAdams, M., Schmid, R. (1985). Inservice types and best practices. Journal of Research and Development, 8, 33-38.

Lawrence, G. (1981). A synthesis for research on the effectiveness of staff development process. Paper presented at the state of Ohio Department of Education annual conference on inservice education.

Loucks, Susan (1983). Transplanting Success. Educational Leadership, 4-19.

Loucks, S. F. and Zacchei, D. A. (1983). Applying OUr Findings to Today's Innovations. Educational Leadership, 41: 28-36.

Louis, K. S., Molitor, J., Rosenblum, S. (1981). Strategies for knowledge use and school improvement. Washington D. C.: United States Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Institute of Education, Programs on dissemination and improvement of practice, research and educational practice. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 207 257.)

McCarthy, Bernice (1982). Improving Staff Development Through CBAM and 4MAT. Education Leadership, 40: 20-21.

McCormick, D. M. (1979). Teachers can learn to teach more effectively. Educational Leadership. 59-60.

Medley, D. M. (1973). A process approach to teacher evaluation. The National Elementary Principal, 52: 33-35.

Mohlman, G. G., Kierstead, Janet, and Gulandah, Mae (1982). Inservice Model for Secondary Teachers. Educational Leadership, 40: 16-19.

Oliva, Peter (1976). Supervision For Today's Schools. New York: Harper & Row.

Sportsman, M. A. (1981). What's wrong with inservice? Part I Problems and Pitfalls, Curriculum Review, 20, 307-311.

Trueblood, C. R., and D. M. Attitude Toward Inservice Education Survey Instrument. The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania.

Appendix A

ATTITUDE TOWARD INSERVICE

Cecil R. Trueblood
Doris M. Trueblood

This is to find out how you feel about inservice. You are to read each statement carefully and decide how you feel about it. Then indicate your feeling by shading the correct space on your answer sheet. Shade

A - if you strongly agree
B - if you agree
C - if your feeling is neutral
D - if you disagree
E - if you strongly disagree

---

1. I believe inservice programs can be used to help teachers improve the organization and content of my school's curriculum.

2. I feel inservice programs provide me with the opportunity to gain recognition and additional responsibilities.

3. I dread attending inservice programs.

4. I feel our inservice programs cannot help teachers improve student behavior in my school.

5. I dislike inservice programs because I feel uneasy about trying out the changes and practices presented to me.

6. I'm not interested in inservice programs because they never help me improve the working conditions in my classroom.

7. I feel good about inservice programs that allow me to share my useful techniques with my colleagues.

8. I feel inservice programs have helped me improve my teaching.

9. I don't feel like participating in inservice programs since they don't help increase my salary.

10. I am interested in inservice programs becuase I feel they help me improve my status in the school district.

11. During inservice programs, I feel pushed into working on things the leaders think are important.

12. I feel inservice programs can be used to help teachers better teach students about the world of work.

13. I believe most central office administrators and supervisors know what the needs of inservice teachers are and how to help them improve their teaching.

© Cecil R. Trueblood and Doris M. Trueblood

14. Inservice programs motivate me to try new techniques.

15. I feel the changes and innovations presented through inservice are unrealistic and if implemented would result in chaos in my classroom.

16. I look forward to participating in inservice programs.

17. I feel inservice program leaders are outsiders who don't understand my classroom problems.

18. I feel good when my principal notices that I am using a new idea or practice presented during an inservice program.

19. I believe inservice programs seldom help me cope with the problems I must face everyday in my classroom.

20. I feel disgusted about inservice programs because I don't often learn things I can use in my classroom.

21. During inservice programs I feel I can work on things I think are important.

22. I believe public support for teachers depends upon how they use inservice programs to change and improve their professional practices.

23. Inservice programs often make me feel irritable and angry.

24. I believe inservice programs can be used to improve the teaching of basic skills in my school.

25. I believe you probably can't change a teacher's behavior through inservice education programs.

26. I feel inservice programs have helped me achieve some of my professional goals.

27. I feel time drags when attending inservice programs.

28. I believe most university professors know that the needs of inservice teachers are and how to help them improve their teaching.

29. I believe most university professors know that the needs of inservice teachers are and how to help them improve their teaching.

30. I believe that changes and innovations presented through inservice disregard what past experience has shown to be effective in my classroom.

31. If properly conducted, I feel inservice programs can help teachers improve the discipline in my school.

32. I believe most of my colleagues really don't know what the needs of inservice teachers are and can't help them improve their teaching.

© Cecil R. Trueblood and Doris M. Trueblood

APPENDIX B
RATING OVERALL LEVEL OF USE

LEVEL	KNOW-LEDGE	ACQUIR-ING INFO.	SHAR-ING	ASSESS-ING	PLANN-ING	STATUS REPORT-ING	PER FORM-ING	OVER ALL LoU
Non-Use D.P. A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orientation D.P. B	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Preparation D.P. C	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II
Mechanical Use D.P. D-1	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	III
Routine D.P. D-2	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA
Redefinement D.P. E	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB
Integration E.P. F	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
Renewal	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI

User A

Pre ----------

Post ----------

APPENDIX B
RATING OVERALL LEVEL OF USE

LEVEL	KNOW-LEDGE	ACQUIR-ING INFO.	SHAR-ING	ASSESS-ING	PLANN-ING	STATUS REPORT-ING	PER FORM-ING	OVER ALL LoU
Non-Use D.P. A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orientation D.P. B	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Preparation D.P. C	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II
Mechanical Use D.P. D-1	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	III
Routine D.P. D-2	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA
Redefinement D.P. E	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB
Integration E.P. F	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
Renewal	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI

User B

Pre ----------

Post ----------

APPENDIX B
RATING OVERALL LEVEL OF USE

LEVEL	KNOW-LEDGE	ACQUIR-ING INFO.	SHAR-ING	ASSESS-ING	PLANN-ING	STATUS REPORT-ING	PER FORM-ING	OVER ALL LoU
Non-Use D.P. A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orientation D.P. B	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Preparation D.P. C	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II
Mechanical Use D.P. D-1	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	III
Routine D.P. D-2	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA
Redefinement D.P. E	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB
Integration E.P. F	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
Renewal	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI

User C

Pre ----------

Post ----------

APPENDIX B
RATING OVERALL LEVEL OF USE

LEVEL	KNOW-LEDGE	ACQUIR-ING INFO.	SHAR-ING	ASSESS-ING	PLANN-ING	STATUS REPORT-ING	PER FORM-ING	OVER ALL LoU
Non-Use D.P. A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orientation D.P. B	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Preparation D.P. C	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II
Mechanical Use D.P. D-1	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	III
Routine D.P. D-2	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA
Redefinement D.P. E	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB
Integration E.P. F	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
Renewal	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI

User D

Pre ----------

Post ----------

APPENDIX B
RATING OVERALL LEVEL OF USE

LEVEL	KNOW-LEDGE	ACQUIR-ING INFO.	SHAR-ING	ASSESS-ING	PLANN-ING	STATUS REPORT-ING	PER FORM-ING	OVER ALL LoU
Non-Use D.P. A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orientation D.P. B	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Preparation D.P. C	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II
Mechanical Use D.P. D-1	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	III
Routine D.P. D-2	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA
Redefinement D.P. E	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB
Integration E.P. F	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
Renewal	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI

User E

Pre ----------

Post ----------

APPENDIX B
RATING OVERALL LEVEL OF USE

LEVEL	KNOW-LEDGE	ACQUIR-ING INFO.	SHAR-ING	ASSESS-ING	PLANN-ING	STATUS REPORT-ING	PER FORM-ING	OVER ALL LoU
Non-Use D.P. A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orientation D.P. B	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Preparation D.P. C	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II
Mechanical Use D.P. D-1	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	III
Routine D.P. D-2	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA
Redefinement D.P. E	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB
Integration E.P. F	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
Renewal	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI

User F

Pre ----------

Post ----------

APPENDIX B
RATING OVERALL LEVEL OF USE

LEVEL	KNOW-LEDGE	ACQUIR-ING INFO.	SHAR-ING	ASSESS-ING	PLANN-ING	STATUS REPORT-ING	PER FORM-ING	OVER ALL LoU
Non-Use D.P. A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orientation D.P. B	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Preparation D.P. C	II	II	II	II	II	II	II	II
Mechanical Use D.P. D-1	III	III	III	III	III	III	III	III
Routine D.P. D-2	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA	IVA
Redefinement D.P. E	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB	IVB
Integration E.P. F	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
Renewal	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI	VI

User G

Pre ----------

Post ----------